The Reconstructionist

Vol. XIII April 4, 1947 Nisan 14, 5707 No. 4

BEGINNING IN THIS ISSUE

- ***THOUGHTS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM: A Christian View of Reconstructionism***

  by Franklin H. Littell

- ***BEYOND TEARS***

  by Pierre van Paassen

- ***PASSOVER . . . 5707***

  by Lillian Reznick Ott

- ***PSALM 119—A Study in the Origins of Pharisaic Religion***

  by Herbert Parzen

- ***THE COMPLICITY OF GERMAN SCHOLARSHIP IN THE CRIMES OF NAZISM (Review)***

  by Max Wiener

- ***TEHIYAH — Youth Supplement***

dicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of
ael's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Jack J. Cohen, Nathan E. Cohen, Samuel Dinin, Abraham G. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Aharon Kessler, Samuel C. Kohs, Myer S. Kripke, Edward T. Sandrow, Judah Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Milton Konvitz, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Jacob J. Weinstein.**
Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

MOSHE DECTER is chairman of the steering committee of the New York Chapter, Reconstructionist Youth Institute.

FRANKLIN HAMLIN LITTELL is director of the Student Religious Association at the University of Michigan and member of the National Executive Committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians.

HERBERT PARZEN is a member of the Rabbinical Assembly of America.

JAY B. STERN is a member of Kvutza, East Midwood Jewish Centre, Brooklyn.

LILLIAN REZNICK OTT is a frequent contributor of poetry to our magazine.

PIERRE VAN PAASSEN is the noted author and lecturer. Among his most famous books are *Days of Our Years, The Forgotten Ally, The Time Is Now, Earth Could Be Fair.*

Max Band (see page 17) was born in Lithuania in 1900. He studied in Berlin and Paris and left Paris in 1940. Since then he has made his home in California. His paintings have been exhibited in Berlin, Paris, New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, Belgium, Holland, Lithuania, Palestine, Switzerland and Japan.

READY NOW!

For Any Public Presentation

THE EISENSTEIN CANTATAS

WHAT IS TORAH?
($1.25 per copy)

OUR BIALIK
($1.50 per copy)

SEVEN GOLDEN BUTTONS
($1.50 per copy)

words and music by IRA AND JUDITH K. EISENSTEIN
(Reduction in price for orders of 10 copies or more.)

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of WHAT IS TORAH?, OUR BIALIK, SEVEN GOLDEN BUTTONS. Check for $..... is enclosed.

Name .....

Address .....

The Reconstructionist

Vol. XIII April 4, 1947 Nisan 14, 5707 No. 4

EDITORIALS

THE STATE OF FREEDOM

As the *Yamim Noraim* are a season of *heshbon nefesh,* f scrutiny of the soul, so Passover should e an occasion, to coin a phrase, of *eshhbon hofesh,* of stocktaking as to free- om and its state.

How then is it with freedom on the esah of 5707?

The reports are diverse, confusing, mu- ially contradictory.

Here, in America, if there are no great dvances to record, neither have there een the many setbacks predicted by the rophets of doom. Our civil liberties have irvived, despite all predictions to the con- ary, the exigencies of war and recon- ersion. The bloody clash between the Negro and White man so commonly fore- old a year or so ago has not only not ome to pass; relations across color lines ow signs of improvement. There are, las, lynchings to mourn and other out- ages over which to burn. But the position f the Negro both in fact and public sen- ment is better than any of us dared ope. And from all over the South come vidences of an awakening awareness and onscience in White men.

Nor has a marked heightening of anti- emitism occurred, as was prognosticated. or is the hatchet likely to be applied as wantonly to the rights of labor as was urged by reactionaries in the first flush of the Republican victory.

This is not to say that all is roseate with liberty in America, that no dangers beset it, that Utopia with two bills of rights in every pot is just around the corner. A new and unhappy factor has just been injected into the situation by President Truman's order imposing a new loyalty test on all Federal employees. Despite all the precautions contained in that order, this is a procedure that almost invites abuse and quite likely will evoke what it invites. In the difficulties it will create for dissenters of all shades and sorts and hence for American freedom as a whole it will, no doubt, do more damage than good. To get rid of a handful of Soviet controlled mice it has brought a torch into the by-no-means fireproof structure of American civil liberties. It is as true today as ever that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We dare not sink into complacency because our liberties have weathered the storms of war. We have not yet met the first serious test of our libertarianism in the post-war era—the economic recession which seems almost certainly on its way. Nevertheless, there is good ground for confidence that freedom in America is a hardier plant than has often been supposed.

What goes for America goes also for many other lands—the British Commonwealth, Western Europe (with Spain and Portugal naturally excepted) parts of

Latin America, here a spot, and there a patch.

But that leaves much of the globe under shadow.

No spirit of liberty, at least none of consequence, has asserted itself in Central Europe. And while the Soviet Union and the lands under its domination are devoted to a liberty of sorts, their notion of liberty is not ours.

Taking them at their word, as we would wish to be taken, their conception of freedom is freedom from want and insecurity; ours is freedom of self-expression, whether in speech, press, religion or political opposition.

Were this all that divided us, a difference in the envisagement of the nature of liberty, all would be simple. We could exchange values and leave men all the freer, both politically and economically, in both worlds, which, with nothing to separate them, would eventually become one.

The issue, alas, is infinitely more complex. Our dedication to political freedom is far from total—witness, for example, our support in the name of *our kind* of freedom, of Greek and Turkish governments which are concerned with *no* kind of freedom except the freedom to exploit. And as for the Russians, we will be more inclined to believe in their notion of emancipation when the first strike has been called *with impunity* by a Russian trade union, or when Stalin has been criticized for his taste in moustaches anywhere in the Russian press.

In a word, the prospects for liberty, internationally viewed, are very bleak.

And if one views the ideal of freedom from the angle of D.P.'s and Palestine, then the outlook is grim indeed. If Judah Halevi be correct, if Israel serves as the heart of the nations or as the thermometer for the warmth of human compassion, then are our hopes at low ebb. Still do Jews rot in D.P. camps. Still are the doors of Palestine shut against them. Still is a boor, devoid of compassion, understanding, vision, the Foreign Minister of a supposedly freedom-loving people. And still are our brethren in Europe a shrieking reproach against European blood lust, British self-serving, American pretense, human contemptibility.

All of which makes our Passover observance the more consequential. Without claiming for ourselves a righteousness we do not possess or a dedication to ideals greater than that of other peoples, we sit ourselves down each year—our Tradition requires it—to a Feast of Freedom, a gay yet solemn ritual dedicated to the emancipation of the individual spirit and of societies from all trammels and restraints. Against our reluctance, perhaps even against our preference, we are by destiny dedicated to freedom for men and groups of every sort.

May our prayers be answered. Let us strive they be answered:

"This year, bondsmen; next year, free men,"—in America, in Israel, everywhere on God's earth and under His sun.

PROTECTING DEMOCRACY FROM COMMUNIST ENCROACHMENT

IN our preceding issue, we approved, at least by inference, the change in American foreign policy indicated in President Truman's address to Congress on the proposal of American aid to Greece and Turkey. Like most Americans, we agree that the further encroachment of totalitarian communism through infiltration, sabotage and conspiracy to effect domination by a communist minority should be checked. We dare not permit the further expansion by violence of any totalitarian regime. To do so would be to repeat the mistakes we made in permitting the development of fascist totalitarianism in Central Eu-

rope and the Far East. Our isolationist neutrality which prevented an early intervention to check the aggressions of Japan in Manchukuo, of Italy in Ethiopia and of Hitler in Europe was a mistake for which we paid a terrible price and which we must not repeat.

But just because we do not want to repeat the mistakes of the past does not obviate the necessity of caution against making new and different mistakes. We must make sure that the means we adopt are such as can achieve the desired end. Our ultimate purpose in coming to the aid of Greece and Turkey is to prevent the spread of regimes that trespass on what we Americans consider fundamental human rights. We want people everywhere to be free in their person, immune from arbitrary arrest, able to speak their minds freely in criticism of their government and to change it when it ceases to represent them. We want them to have free access to sources of information and adequate opportunities for health and education. And, of course, we want them to enjoy full religious fredom. We desire these things not from purely philanthropic motives but for the sake of our own security. We cannot feel safe in a world in which an ambitious individual or clique that controls a totalitarian government can use its nation's resources of men and goods to menace our own way of life here in America.

But considering the means our government proposes to apply, in relation to its ultimate purpose, we are frankly alarmed by the situation. It disturbs us that of the $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey, 62 per cent is to be devoted to equipping their armies. Greece and Turkey are not democracies. The Greek government was put into power and kept in power by the British army and is hated by a large part of the population. To be sure the form of an election was used to give it legitimacy but it was an election in which only rightist parties participated. Turkey does not even pretend to be a democracy, and was at one time on the very verge of joining the Axis powers in the war. Had Stalingrad fallen, it would have entered on the side of Germany. The assumption of our government seems to be that, if communism, be kept from those countries, they can be counted upon to ally themselves with the democracies. But "it ain't necessarily so." Hitler's Germany was permitted to grow strong as a foil to Russian communism and where did that policy get us? Autocracies cannot be counted on as faithful allies of the democracies.

To be sure, the immediate danger seems to be from the expansionist tendencies of Soviet-backed communism, and the exigencies of the situation may require our temporarily backing governments of which we do not approve. But if we must back them, we should realize that our doing so offers no real solution to our problem unless we lay down such conditions as will directly serve our ultimate pupose, the strengthening of political democracy everywhere as the basis of security and peace for all nations.

To do that, we must do more than give money, particularly when that money will enhance the prestige of oppressive and unpopular regimes, and stamp us in the eyes of the people as the backers of their governments *against them,* as defenders not of democracy but—as the Communists would have them believe—of a predatory fascistic form of capitalism.

To defend democracy against the encroachments of communism is no simple task. Communism enjoys from the outset an unfair advantage. By a single *coup d'état,* it can easily impose itself on a war-weakened country. But democracy cannot be imposed; it must be achieved.

Nor can it be propagandized effectively

by mere words or even by a bribe of money or food. All these may be interpreted as the window dressing of an expansionist capitalist imperialism. We are dealing with people who have not had the experience of long years of relatively secure living under free institutions. These people see their own governing class living in luxury while the rest of the population does not know where its next meal is coming from. Is it not inevitable that they will be more attracted by the communist slogans of a classless society and economic security for all, whether these slogans be true or not, than by the right of the suffrage or freedom of speech?

If our purpose really is to buttress democracy in the regions most likely to fall under the sway of communism, we must enable their peoples to experience the benefits of democracy. We must put such conditions to the help we proffer to their governments as will insure to their citizens not only the personal liberties we enjoy but the economic security that our ideological opponents promise them. We have enough faith in democracy to believe that, if properly applied, it can bring prosperity. And we must demonstrate that faith by demanding as conditions of help the inauguration of such measures as will afford the people both freedom and prosperity. More important than financing the military expenditures of these governments to resist aggression from without would be financing such public works as would remove the causes of dissension from within by bringing prosperity to the country. We should help to finance such projects as control of water-power, improvement of roads, capital investment in promising industrial ventures, improvement of agricultural techniques and extension of educational opportunities. Moreover, to insure that the fruits of these investments accrue to the benefit of the people, and be not misappropriated by the present ruling classes, we must insist on the establishment of decent political conditions — amnesty to dissident groups within the state, disarmament of rightist as well as leftist armed parties, the immediate inclusion of all non-communist parties in the government, and the early election of a new government under supervision insuring the fairness of election procedure.

Only if such a policy is followed, will our efforts to render democratic government secure in the world have much chance of success.

RABBIS AND INTERMARRIAGE

THE Anglo-Jewish press, and the general press in New York, recently carried a story about an "inter-faith" marriage ceremony, in which a rabbi and a Protestant minister participated. The rabbi was Jacob J. Weinstein, of Chicago, a distinguished Reform rabbi, and a member of the contributing board of *The Reconstructionist*. His participation in this ceremony aroused a good deal of discussion, and many questions have been asked of us regarding our position on the subject of intermarriage. Naturally, we were eager to learn from Rabbi Weinstein directly what the precise facts were; one cannot always trust newspaper reports. Rabbi Weinstein confirmed the reports, but added that this had been an exceptional case, and that in the eighteen years of his ministry there had been only one other similar case which, in his judgment, merited special consideration.

The main motivation, he said, was to keep these "idealistic young couples in the Jewish fold." He was "convinced that the conversion of the non-Jewish parties would be meaningless."

We do not believe that Rabbi Weinstein was wise in making these exceptions.

We need not labor the point with him that intermarriage strikes at the very foundations of our life as a group. If Judaism is to survive, the Jewish family must be protected from all influences likely to weaken it, for the citadel of Judaism has, has been, and will continue to be, the home. That Rabbi Weinstein recognizes this very evident truth may be deduced from his statement that he has (with the two exceptions mentioned) "always insisted on the conversion of the non-Jewish parties to Judaism." The issue, then, is: can exceptions be allowed? We do not believe so.

First, we believe that neither of the two reasons given by him is valid. Conversion is never "meaningless." If idealistic young people consent to conversion, there is very good reason to believe that they will take it seriously. Almost anyone can quote instances in which the converted non-Jew made an even better Jew than the one born to Judaism. Second, if conversion is rejected, in what sense can it be said that they would be kept within the Jewish fold? Are they likely to become devoted Jews if, at the beginning, they insist upon the presence of a Protestant minister at the marriage ceremony?

Further, the very participation in the ritual by a rabbi and a minister is likely to give the impression that such marriages have the blessing of all those concerned with improving inter-faith relations. Carried further, an exclusively Jewish marriage may come to be regarded as an obstacle to better understanding. Marriage, after all, is a religious covenant, not only in Judaism, but in other faiths as well; and the impressionable public must not be led to suspect that organized Christianity is any the more eager for intermarriages than is the synagogue.

One can perhaps understand making exceptions in Jewish practice when extreme hardship might be involved for the couple if the religious ceremony were denied them. But, in a democracy like ours, there is always resort to the civil marriage. The religious institutions do not possess the power of decreeing happiness or loneliness for anyone. Civil marriages have the same legal status as any other. There is therefore no denial of anyone's rights if a rabbi refuses to participate in an intermarriage and give sanction to it by his presence.

Finally, we believe that the alarming increase in the number of intermarriages must in every possible way be stopped. It will not be stopped by a procedure which allows every rabbi to use his own judgment in each and every case. Unless Jews realize that intermarriage is universally and unanimously frowned upon, and that the Jewish community will not give its sanction to such a union, young people will continue to allow themselves to fall in love with non-Jews, confident that they will be able to satisfy their parents and their Jewish friends by getting some rabbi somewhere to "tie the knot."

At this crucial stage in the life of our people, those of us who believe in the survival of Israel and dedicate ourselves to it have no other course. We cannot always prevent intermarriages; but we can always register our protest against them. This much every rabbi should do.

TEHIYAH

WE call our readers' attention to the supplement, *Tehiyah,* which will be a recurring feature in our magazine. *Tehiyah* is prepared by the Reconstructionist Youth Institute and appeared originally, for two issues, as a separate bulletin distributed to members of the Institute and to a selected list of leaders of young people's organizations.

We have referred to it as a bulletin, but, from its inception it has aimed at

being more than that. The editors had hoped it would become a magazine for American Jewish youth, the only Jewish youth magazine which is not devoted to some special phase of Judaism, such as Zionism, the Synagogue, fraternalism or Jewish defense, but to the integration of all these interests in accordance with the Reconstructionist conception of Judaism as a civilization. As a mere bulletin of information about the activities of the Reconstructionist Youth Institute, *Tehiyah* might have been able to continue its separate existence, but it lacked the means to develop into an independent magazine with a circulation sufficiently large to exert a great influence on Jewish youth movements in America. By incorporating *Tehiyah* as a supplement of *The Reconstructionist* we give it at once a circulation that will bring it to the attention of many more young people between the ages of 20 and 30, the group represented in the Institute.

Moreover we regard it as important that our older readers keep in touch with what young people who are concerned about the future of Judaism are thinking and doing. We are confident that they will find the articles written by these young men and women stimulating and worthy of serious consideration. Reconstructionism is a forward-looking movement. Its success depends on its ability to capture the imagination of our youth and to mobilize them in the service of Judaism. We are therefore happy to give them this forum for the discussion of their needs and their problems.

The inclusion of *Tehiyah* in *The Reconstructionist* is merely a technical arrangement which leaves the responsibility for the contents of *Tehiyah,* where it has always been, with the Reconstructionist Youth Institue. Young people who feel that they have something significant to say to Jews of their own age should send their literary contributions to the editors of *Tehiyah.* It is still their hope, as it is ours, that this supplement may serve as an organ of expression for all our youth regardless of their denominational and organizational affiliation, that it will be used by adherents of our various Jewish youth movements to address those who are not enrolled in their ranks. It should therefore make for a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation among all young Jews who take an affirmative attitude to the survival of the Jewish people and of Judaism.

REALITIES AND VALUES

A DISPATCH FROM JERUSALEM reported in *Religious News Service* (March 20, 1947) states that the Palestine government has issued a decree abolishing polygamy among oriental Jews. The decree imposes a penalty for polygamy of imprisonment for a term up to five years, except in the case of husbands whose subsequent marriages have been approved by the rabbinical courts and ratified by the Ashkenazic and Sephardic Chief Rabbis of Jerusalem .

The report adds that the new ordinance has been favorably received by Jewish leaders. The decree does not affect the Moslem community.

To us the news brings a sense of humiliation. Why should it have been necessary for the government to effect this needed reform, when the rabbinate and the *Keneset Yisrael,* the recognized Jewish authorities in such matters, might have achieved the same results without government intervention?

Back in the 11th century, Rabbenu Gershom was able to effect the abolition of polygamy among European Jews, and if the rabbinate of Eretz Yisrael had had the courage and social vision of a Rab-

nu Gershom, it could have abolished lygamy for the entire Yishuv without vernment intervention.

What a reflection upon our Jewish re- ious authorities in Eretz Yisrael!

▼

THE DETERMINATION TO RE- im the Negev, the arid southern region Eretz Yisrael for human settlement is e of the boldest of the many daring ploits of our *halutzim*. Something of the rdship that confronts them in this irsty region as well as of the spirit in ich they meet their troubles is indi- ted in the following jest, reported by ezer Kaplan, the treasurer of the Jew- Agency, in an address to the recent onist Congress:

"Do you know," one of the *halutzim* the Negev had asked him, "what is nsidered in the Negev a rich soup? One ich contains a lot of water."

▼

IN THE MARCH ISSUE OF *Liberal daism*, there is an article, "Where We Park?" by W. A. Goldberg of the troit City Plan Commission, which dis- sses the need of off-street parking space synagogues and churches. A number municipalities have been passing ordi- nces requiring parking space in pro- rtion to the seating capacity of the agogues.

If such regulations become general, they l pose quite a question to certain nservative Jewish congregations whose mbers ride to services in their autos t pay deference to the traditional pro- ition against riding on the Sabbath parking their cars a block or two away. their synagogues will have to have king lots in their immediate vicinity, l these Jews still keep up the pious tense and not use the parking lot?

▼

THOSE WHO WORK IN THE vish field in America, even when they affirm the possibility of Jewish life in the diaspora, often have their moments of doubt. They should derive encouragement from the impressions of America and American Jewry which Dr. Magnes took away with him on his recent visit and about which he reported in his opening address for the 22nd academic year of the Hebrew University.

With regard to American life in general he noted "a new generation struggling to give effect to the American tradition of equality and freedom." He was impressed with the progress of the American Negro and the growing recognition of his claims to equality. He was also impressed with the tremendous increase in the numbers attending the universities, and with the growing attention being given to questions of religion and philosophy.

As for Jewish life, he was astounded by the revolutionary change in American Jewry's attitude to Zionism. "Who better than myself is aware," he said, "of the difficulties encountered by those who then ventured to call themselves Zionists. It is the reverse today—those who oppose Zionism complain that they are being persecuted." But the reaffirmation of Jewish values is not confined to Zionism. Dr. Magnes found an intensified interest in Judaism generally, "a gestation beneath the surface," "a whole literature" growing up about the question of the content and value of Judaism, a growing disposition to express Jewish themes in art, and a great expansion in Jewish higher education.

▼

HERMAN L. WEISMAN, CHAIR- man of the American Zionist Youth Commission announces the establishment of a Hebrew Arts Foundation. This organization is designed to make permanent the work of the Hebrew Arts Committee

(*Continued on Page* 24)

Thoughts About the Future of Christianity and Judaism:

A CHRISTIAN VIEWS RECONSTRUCTIONISM

By FRANKLIN H. LITTELL

The need for reconstructing Judaism arises from conditions that affect Christianity as well, though not necessarily in the same way and to the same extent. Thinking Jews cannot fail to be interested in the Christian response to these conditions and Christian thinkers are frequently quite sensitively aware of the Jewish response to them.

We are therefore happy to present the following paper by an eminent Christian religious philosopher who has taken pains to familiarize himself with Jewish Reconstructionist thought. Prof. Littell's views are not, in all respects, in agreement with our viewpoint. In a future issue, Mordecai M. Kaplan will comment on some of Professor Littell's opinions.

In view of the length of Prof. Littell's article, we have had to divide it into two parts. The second part will discuss "Covenantal Peoplehood and the Universalist Dream."—EDITORS.

PART I. VOLUNTARISM vs. AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

ON Tuesday, June 12, 1945, at the McAlpin Hotel in New York City, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada held a special meeting which had been called for the purpose of dealing with the new Prayer Book published by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation. The meeting was announced in the Yiddish press, and drew over 200 members of the Orthodox Union. Fiery speeches were made, and upon committee recommendation the body unanimously voted a *herem*, a writ of excommunication, against Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan. With solemn ceremony the audience arose to repeat word for word the text of the first *Psalm*. The ban was then issued. Thereafter occurred a comic incident, comic because so thoroughly out of time and place: a young rabbi placed the book upon a table and burnt it.

When approached by reporters, Dr. Kaplan made the appropriate reply: He denied the authority of the body. He said, in effect, "I don't belong to their association." The Rabbinical Assembly of America, the national organization of the Conservative Rabbinate, stated that they denied "the authority of any outside body to sit in judgment on one of our colleagues." The Alumni Association of the Jewish Institute of Religion of New York on June 20th condemned the tactics of the Union, "in sitting in judgment upon and excommunicating a distinguished rabbi in Israel who was not a member of their organization. . . ." [1] The issue was thus squarely drawn and symbolized: — *a conflict in essentials between those who still conceived of Israel as a theocratic state and those who are prepared to live in twentieth century America in a pluralistic society where life at the sub-political level is voluntary.* The Reconstructionist leader thus became the focus of a concept of religious community which was championed four hundred years ago in radical Protestantism, and which is coming to be the dominant pattern of vital Christianity. We may prophesy with some assurance that Judaism which survives will also be that which accepts, as the Recon-

[1] "A Challenge to Freedom of Worship" (The Reconstructionist Foundation, 1945), N. Y., *passim.*

structionist is prepared to do, the fact that mature and vital religion has come to be that of intentional affiliation.

The Record of Compulsion in Religion

The long and black record of compulsion in religion is plain enough. We may profitably refer to Christian experience, for the concept of Christendom is closely related to the enforced segregation and political isolation of the Jews through centuries. A missionary historian reports that in any review we must

> ". . . consider coercion as a method of evangelization, for, as a matter of fact, it has had a large place in the history of Christianity. The church has depended upon the support of secular forces for the defense and extension of the faith throughout most of its history. Under Constantine the church made an alliance with political power which has never been completely dissolved." [2]

That the active union of religious and political authorities is not a dead issue is testified by varying degrees of disability and persecution about the world today.[3] Of Spain, where a repressive union of Church and State was re-established in November, 1939, it is reported:

> ". . . the Roman Catholic Church authorities insist on baptizing all children. They are steadily reconsolidating their position and regaining their hold over the schools, in which Roman Catholic religious instruction has been reintroduced by making the teaching of the catechism obligatory.[4]

To this day, the official dogma of Rome involves the use of civil power to enforce religious conformity where possible. In Italy, the 1929 Concordat of Mussolini and the Pope brought the schools into line, and placed the Waldensians and other non-conformists in a jeopardy from which they have yet to emerge.[5] Even in America there has been no softening of the imperial doctrine, although the fact of religious pluralism has prevented the logic of traditional teaching from making itself felt on a national scale. On the other hand, there are signs that the old pattern among Protestant state churches is breaking up. Pastor Martin Niemöller was recently cited as follows:

> "He said recently that he 'was raised a Lutheran and did not realize that the traditional Lutheran theology regarding the state was wrong.'
>
> "He now believes that the church must exercise stronger influence on political life, as in England and the United States, where the church 'acts as the conscience of the state'." [6]

The Hungarian Reformed churches in the Transtisza area have voted to adopt a system of financing through voluntary contributions, for the sake of "a free church in a free state." [7] We may hope that in many countries similar action will be taken on democratic principle by the Socialist and left-wing Christian governments, for ineptitude and indecision at this point will produce an inevitable revulsion against Christianity because of the sins of the established churches. *The corollary to a politically maintained "Christendom" is the ghetto for the Jews, the ancient pattern in which corporate*

---

[2] White, Hugh Vernon, *A Theology for Christian Missions.* (Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), N. Y. & Chicago. p. 4.

[3] Bates, M. Searle, *Religious Liberty: An Inquiry.* (Harper & Brothers, 1945), N. Y. & London. pp. 546-48.

[4] McLeish, Alexander, "Religious Freedom in . . . Europe." (World Dominion Press, 1945), London. No. 8—War-Time Survey Series; Part IV of "Europe in Transition." p. 50.

[5] Religious News Service dispatch, reported in VI *Christianity and Crisis* (July 8, 1946), 12-13.

rights are defined for minorities which resist assimilation of individuals into the larger body. Furthermore, *the price of nominal and externally enforced religious submission is practical unbelief.* Cardinal Lavitrano of Palermo once stated in a pastoral letter that "66 per cent of the Italians do not hear mass on religious holidays, and only 12 per cent of the men receive communion at Easter." [8] Similar figures have been given for Latin America, also ostensibly "Christian." We may wisely conclude with Dr. White:

> "Promoting at best a minimum of outward conformity, force tends inevitably to the destruction of the spiritual reality of Christian faith and life." [9]

The same may be said of force when used to "defend" Judaism.

Origins of Voluntary Religious Association

Compelled conformity has been associated in Protestantism with national interest, and it does not produce a universal world-view. The most energetic missionary groups of the sixteenth century were, significantly, precisely those who championed voluntary religious association: the despised "Anabaptists."[10] These radicals of the Reformation, forerunners in a general sense of the Free Churches, have been so maligned by apologists for state-church Protestantism—as well as by socialist writers who professed to find in them a fore-shadowing of modern economic radicalism—that their essential testimony usually has been missed. They were, as their long hidden Confessions of Faith make clear, radical Reformers; [11] they pressed on beyond Luther and Zwingli (whom they termed "half-way men") to gather little congregations without deference to the political powers. At a time when the dominant establishments were able to agree at Augsburg to a political settlement of religious choices (1555- *"cuius regio eius religio"*—"the governing power determines the religion"), the Täufer have missioners in as widely scattered points as Krakow (Poland), Salonica (Greece), and Aachen (the Netherlands). They believed that no one might be compelled rightly in matters of faith.[12]

The vision of the Anabaptists was the restitution of the pure spiritual life of the Early Church. In that Golden Age of the Church faith was spontaneous and uncoerced.

---

[6] As reported in XXVII *The Lutheran* (September 26, 1945) 52:4.

[7] Religious News Service dispatch, reported in VI *Christianity and Crisis* (June 24, 1946) 11:7.

[8] Reported in McLeish, Alexander, *loc. cit.*, p. 43.

[9] White, Hugh Vernon, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

[10] A better term is "evangelical *Täufer,*" for they were called "Anabaptists" by Roman Catholic and state-church Protestant enemies, in order that they might suffer the old Roman death penalty for re-baptizers. Friedmann, Robert, "Conception of the Anabaptists." IX. *Church History* (1940), 341-65, 362. "They repudiated the name, insisting that infant baptism did not constitute true baptism and that they were not in reality re-baptizers. Their argument was of no avail. The name was so conveniently elastic that it came to be applied to all those who stood out against authoritative state religion." Evans, Austin Patterson, *An Episode in the Struggle for Religious Freedom: The Sectaries of Nuremberg,* 1524-1528, (Columbia University Press, 1924), N. Y., pp. 14-15.

[11] The dominant parties successfully suppressed the *Täufer* records, so that until recently even impartial historians have had to rely upon the hostile polemics of Justus Menius, Heinrich Bulinger and others who condemned the radical Reformers as "enthusiasts" and "revolutionaries." Of greatest moment are the volumes projected by the *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte,* 2½ out of 13 of which had appeared when the war intervened. See the statement of plan in Bossert, Gustav, *ed., Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer: Hertzogtum Württemberg* (M. Heinsius Nachf., Leipzig, pp. v-vi. The sections in print appear as XIII:1, XVI:2 and XX:1 of *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte.*

"But later, when Sylvester the 34th Pope, paid tribute and prevailed upon Constantine the Great, who was the 34th Emperor, with many flattering, sanctimonious words, (having) agreed to be a Christian in baptism, the Emperor provided throughout his whole realm great peace, with good intention to do thereby a service to God, to the Pope as Roman Bishop, and to all who called themselves Christian. That is the disease of craftiness, which slunk in the window, and the corruption which perverted at High Noon. Crowding in with power, the Cross was conquered and forged to the sword. All that happened through the slyness of the Old Serpent." [13]

They dated the "Fall of the Church" [14] with Constantine and believed that with the Christian Emperor the free society of true believers became the Church of the Land, with authority resting upon outward compulsion rather than upon the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God (*Ephesians* 6:17). They took with utmost seriousness the Great Commission of their Master (*Matthew* 28: 18-20, *Mark* 16:15-16):

"Our faith stands on nothing other than the command of Christ, *Mat.* 28, *Mark* 16). For Christ didn't say to his disciples: Go forth and celebrate the Mass, but go forth and preach the Gospel." [15]

Baptism (*Erwachsenentaufe*) was to follow the evangel, being the outward symbol of an inner motion. In his testimony before the court Julius Lober said:

"Luther and other Christian teachers do not preach nor teach baptism as it was taught at the time of the apostles. . . . Saith further, that Luther and others promote no true Christian order, that they suffer and permit whoredom, avarice, usury, blasphemy and other depravity in the community, which the apostles did not let go so far, but had the ban among them." [16]

We shall speak later of the Ban (*Matthew* 18:19) and its place in a vigorous voluntary association. At this point it is important to note that, to whatever extent the historiography of the Anabaptists was primitivist in type notwithstanding, they yet established a pattern of religious community which has today become the mark of sectarian Protestantism. An eminent church historian has voiced the opinion that the tragic state of Germany today may be in part due to the fact that the "Left-Wing" of the Reformation was persecuted and suppressed there, while it came to fruition in England and America.[17]

The world-view of Christianity spread

---

[12] "Wir zwingen niemands zum glauben. . . .!" — a proud boast! Zieglschmid, A. J. F., *ed., Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, 1943), Cayuga Press, Inc., Ithaca, N. Y., p. 75.

[13] *Ibid., p.* 34.

[14] See the author's article, "A Pattern of Religious Primitivism," in I. *The Union Seminary Quarterly Review,* (March, 1946), 3:22f.

[15] Beck, Josef, *ed., Die Geschichts-bücher der Wiedertäufer in Osterreich-Ungarn* (Carl Gerolds Sohn, 1883), Wien; XLIII. *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* (Hist. Comm. der kaiserl. Akad. der Wiss.3, 2:62, 64 (quoting Hanss Schlaffe).

[16] Given May 12, 1531. Printed in Schornbaum, Karl, *ed., Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer: Markgraftum Brandenburg* (M. Heinsius Nachf., 1934), Leipzig; XVI:2. *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte.* No. 267, pp. 243-47, 244.

[17] Bainton, Roland H., "The Left Wing of the Reformation," XXI. *The Journal of Religion,* (April, 1941), 2:124-34, 134. Contrast the attitude of the state-church historian, Karl Holl, in "Luther und die Schwärmer": "Therein our German concept is sharply distinguished from the sect-influenced English-American. More valuable to us is the unity in the State, the furthering and deepening of the community of *Volk,* which stand higher with us than free movement of the individual." *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* (J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), Tübingen, I, 466.

by the Pauline missions-method rather than by the sword, and the insistence that State and Church should be strictly separated, became closely related marks of radical Protestantism. In their Confestions of Faith the Anabaptists put their property and themselves at the disopsal of the Church; every baptized believer was subject to the Great Commission, for the expansion of the faith was no longer a matter for princes to decide. From the Anabaptist congregations to the Student Volunteer Movement is no direct line; but the early revolutionaries against Christendom would have understood a student generation which embraced the world in its glance, and urged that every true Christian ought either to go as a missionary or help support those who went.

Christianity Not Declining

Due to the influence of secular ideas among the intellectuals, it is frequently heard that Christianity has been declining under the impact of science, revolution and war. Dr. Kaplan inclines to the opinion that while Roman Catholicism has maintained its integrity of community more stubbornly than Protestantism, both are waning.

> "With the growth and shift of populations, the progress of democracy and the resultant redistribution of human society, the historic social groups are dissolving and new ones are forming in their place. The process of redistribution and reorganization is being carried on at the expense of personal equilibrium. These conditions are by no means favorable to the flourishing of a religion that is indigenous and relevant. Today, the Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan religions may be considered as being in a state of suspended animation. At the present time, the creeds, ritual and ceremonies of the various historic religions are not vitally significant even to the majority of those who observe them." [18]

There are various indices to the strength of religion, and some of the negative indications will be noted below. We have, however, to repudiate the frequently encountered idea that the Christian drama came to the end with the Reformation In spite of set-backs, the century 1815-1914 was the greatest period in the expansion of Christianity. More than that, in very recent decades Christianity has become the first global religion—with congregations of every race, color, language, government.

> "The part which Christianity has played in the last hundred years in reducing language to writing, in introducing new forms of education and of medicine, and in reshaping the ideals of entire peoples in the neo-Occidental world has been without equal in the history of Christianity, and, for that matter, of any other religion." [19]

And, significantly enough, *it was precisely in this period that the individual believer*—rather than the prince or commercial lord—*became the prototype and carrying power of the movement.*

> "Even in the Occident, where, if one views only one side of the picture, Christianity has seemed to be losing ground, the past century and a half have witnessed gains which may have more than offset the losses. The fashion in which millions of Christians have voluntarily contributed financially to the propagation of their faith at home and abroad

[18] *Judaism as a Civilization,* (The Macmillan Co., 1934), N. Y., p. 200.

[19] Latourette, Kenneth Scott, "New Perspectives in Church History," XXI. *The Journal of Religion,* (October, 1941), 4:432-43, 438-441-42.

has in magnitude been without precedent in the history of Christianity. . . ." [20]

s Dr. Latourette, author of the great story of *The Expansion of Christian-y*,[21] analyzes it:

"Protestantism is becoming more weighted on the left-wing, radical phases of the movement, more ecumenical and less regional, more inclusive and less a sectarian division, and more varied and yet finding a comprehensive unity which permits and even encourages diversity.

"From the radical wing come a majority of the missionaries who are propagating Protestant Christianity in other lands. This means that the world-wide Protestantism of the decades ahead is probably to depart further from the Christianity of pre-Reformation days than has that of Western Europe and the British Isles. Presumably, the trend will be augmented as the 'younger churches' in non-Occidental countries mount in strength." [22]

The record of radical Protestantism's reak from the concept of Christendom nd the coercion, external or implicit,[23] hich marked it seems particularly use-il to discussions of Reconstructionism. or we must not think that to the Ana-aptists their religious community was ierely free association; it was *peoplehood* i the full and conventoinal sense.[24] The mphasis upon Community (*Gemein-haft*) was very marked in their writ-igs, a practice which was economic and ultural as well as religious.

"Item: Our Christian faith says, a holy Christian Church and a communion (*Gemeinschaft*) of saints; whoever now recognizes the communion (*Gemeinschaft*) of saints with the mouth but does not maintain Community (*Gemeinschaft*), he is false." [25]

Upon this restoration of the economy of the Church at Jerusalem (*Acts* 2.4.5) the radicals built a vigorously disciplined and ethical congregational life. The New Testament ordinance (*Matthew* 18:15-17) was the beginning of every elaboration of the problem of government within the Church, and it is obvious that it presupposed a freely and democratically acting congregation which did not depend upon any worldly power for authority but upon its own spirit of fellowship.[26]

"After the people have received the Word of God and through water-baptism in the presence of the church have put themselves under

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

[21] (Harper & Bros., Publ., 1937-45) ; volumes V, V & VI especially.

[22] Latourette, Kenneth Scott, "A Historian ooks Ahead; The Future of Christianity in ie Light of Its Past," XV. *Church History*, March, 1946), 1:3-16, 12, 14.

[23] In a recent effort to re-think the concept of Christendom, the author states that he is prepared to defend only the "open" view of Christian civilization, a political situation in which no disabilities are suffered by dissenting groups. "Such a recovered Christian civilization would clearly be of the open type which alone I am prepared to defend, and in it the older conscriptive idea of the Church's authority would have completely given place to the idea of religious freedom." Baillie, John, *What Is Christian Civilization?*, (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), N. Y., p. 41. In spite of this reservation, the price of "Christendom" is a special status for Jews and a dangerous immobility for the Church.

[24] Burrage, Champlin, *The Church Covenant Idea*, (American Baptist Publication Society, 1904), Philadelphia. Chapter I.

[25] In the Five Articles of the Hutterian Brethren (c. 1547), printed in Müller, Lydia, *ed., Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnten*, (M. Heinsius Nachf., 1938), Leipzig; XX:1. *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformations-geschichte*, p. 244.

[26] Neff, Christian, "Bann," in I. *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, (Hege & Neff, 1913), Frankfurt & Weierhof (Pfalz), pp. 115-19.

obligation to God to live according to the Word, and if they are ready to walk in newness of life and henceforth not to let sin reign in the mortal body, they still have need of medicine, because men are by nature children of wrath, evil and incapable, whereby the foul and stinking flesh together with the poisoned members may be somehow cut off, in order that the whole body may not be dishonored and corrupted." [27]

In court it was testified of their churches:

"XVIII. They have no rulers, one is like the other, all equal in the service of one another.

"XX. When they are together it is their custom to speak of the Word of God and to admonish one another in a brotherly fashion." [28]

We should not assume that free congregational life involves indifference to matters of discipline.[29] Rather the congregations took to themselves the responsibility which had formerly rested with the government, and which could not be properly exercised when Church and State were united. *Free churchmanship was born not in indifference to discipline but on the proposition that authority should be wielded not by the political power (Obrigkeit) but democratically in the congregation.* The price of a free society is that citizens, in their voluntary associations, shall establish and maintain vigorous patterns of high thought and conduct which make a monolithic totalitarianism unnecessary and impossible.[30]

Reconstructionism, in common with the free church tradition, rejects the use of political coercion to enforce religious conformity in favor of a "community life based on voluntarism." *This involves a sharp break from the pattern of authority which has dominated the religious line of Christians and Jews for centuries.* In its own quest for a new pattern of "peoplehood," Reconstructionism is as significant in its place as were the Anabaptists in their time. And the God of History, who is in His own good time giving the victory to those who practice true Christian liberty, will authenticate and extend the Reconstructionist testimony. *(To be concluded)*

---

[27] Quotation from Hübmaier in Newman, A. H., "Balthazar Hübmaier and the Moravian Anabaptists," XXVII. *Goshen College Record, Review Supplement* (1926), 10:4-22, 12.

[28] Testimony of Ambrosius Spitelmeier (c. September 9, 1527), No. 31, in Schornbaum, Karl, *ed., op. cit., pp.* 27, 28.

[29] Egli, Emil, *Analecta Reformatoria,* (Zürcher & Furrer, 1899), Zürich, I, 103, Horsch, John, *Mennonites in Europe,* (Mennonite Publishing House, 1942), Scottdale, Penna., pp. 323f. Joachim Wach seems to me seriously to misstate the situation in his *Sociology of Religion,* (University of Chicago Press, 1944), Chicago: "The term 'free church' has the double meaning of freedom from secular interference, e.g., from the side of the state), and of freedom from coercion in religious matters, (e.g., compulsory discipline)," p. 148. The first half of the statement is true, the second part misses the entire ground of the argument: that governance in matters of faith cannot be rightly exercised by government, because it rightly belongs to the believing people. (" . . . it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us. . . ." (*Acts* 15:28). Only a few prophets and *Spiritualisten* at that time held to the doctrine of irresponsible and unrelated "conscience" which has now, unhappily, become so popular.

[30] This is brilliantly reasoned by A. D. Lindsay in *The Essentials of Democracy,* (Univ. of Penna. Press, 1929), Phila. On the separation of Church and State: "The corollary of that is Lord Acton's doctrine that liberty is possible only in a society where there are centres of organization other than the political. Nothing so much makes possible a public opinion which is real because it is based on free and frank discussion as the existence of independent voluntary organizations with public purposes." p. 40. In fascism, all "undesirable" group sovereignty was deliberately destroyed. Democracies should encourage the group configurations and associations of voluntary discipline which make government a creative process, if sometimes very difficult. Kirchheimer, Otto, "In Quest of Sovereignty," VI. *The Journal of Politics.*

From a painting by Max Band

Where shall the weary rest—
When shall the lonely of heart come home—
What doors are open for the wanderer?
And which of us shall find his father,
Know his face, and in what place,
And in what time, and in what land?

THOMAS WOLFE

Beyond Tears!

By PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

AT this moment when the tragic remnants of the wish people need their homeland more an ever in the past, the doors of Pales-ne remain hermetically closed. And ose of them who by almost superhuman forts, do manage to escape from the ll and moral degradation of Europe's ncentration camps in leaky tubs and akeshift vessels that would be rejected by decent people for the transport of cattle, even those are intercepted by the shiny steel destroyers of the "glorious" British Navy and are put behind barbed wire on the Island of Cyprus.

It is of these weary wanderers of Israel that Max Band treats in his latest great composition. Band has immortalized their plight and their unutterable woe. There is a terrible and direct personal appeal

to the beholder in this masterful canvas. See and consider, the shunted and hounded men and women seem to say, see and consider if ever dolor was as bitter as ours! Their inexpressible helplessness is expressed. Although stricken dumb and speechless with suffering, they speak in a manner which only a great heart as that of a master like Band can utter and understand.

But Max Band has done more than depict human misery. With his painting he has indicted a civilization. And he has done it as prophetically as Zola once judged a corrupt ruling class with his "*J'accuse.*" For, invisible but tangible and felt as if they were physically present, are the contemporary statesmen who in brushed raiment and with plausible speech talk of justice and international collaboration. Beyond those dark clouds are the vast throngs of worshipers in the temples of our time singing in mighty chorus of man's brotherhood and of God's fatherhood. Behind the rotting gunwales of that refugee ship are the well-fed self-satisfied diplomats, Jewish and Christian alike, who smilingly once more put down . . . theories about the rights of man in . . . meaningless protocols.

Of what brotherhood do you speak? Band asks, as he shows us humble men, women and children, shifted and pushed to and fro in the world as if they were dangerous wild beasts or loathesome lepers. How dare you take the name of God on your lips and allow this injustice to persist? How long will you with your silence cover and condone the evil-doers of Empire?

In the background of Band's impressive canvas, above the white-capped waves are dark Rembrandtesque Dutch clouds. They are moving toward each other. There remains a limited space of sunlight. But it, too, is a murky sky, already streaked with portents of storm and darkness. It is the last glimpse of God's goodness. It is the last chance for man to love his neighbor as himself. Shall the clouds close? Shall the scene be turned into night? Total night seems near. Lord, abide with us! the prophetic painter seems to say. Let not this world be blotted out in the blackness of despair!

Max Band's latest composition is a great prayer in color! He prays for the eternal supremacy of righteousness and compassion.

Passover . . . 5707

By LILLIAN REZNICK OTT

I shall sing my song of freedom
Though I be bounden still;
I shall rid my joy of fetters
And let my spirit thrill.
I cannot be less trusting
Than a full-blowing autumn bloom,
Or despair of tomorrow's sunrise
Because of to-night's black gloom.

Though chains be depressive and bitter
And the dawn, at times, break dim,
I shall lift my faith to heaven
And revive my hope with a hymn.
I shall sing my song of freedom
Though bonds contain me still;
I shall quaff the joy of Passover
And let my spirit thrill.

Psalm 119—A Study in the Origins of Pharisaic Religion

By HERBERT PARZEN

IDEAS, including religious ideas, are created by the individual thinker. In due course, as they demonstrate that they truthfully deepen the human spirit and enrich the cultural panorama, they are accepted by larger and larger numbers until they become institutionalized. Thereby they become part of the pattern of civilization.

The Psalmist and His Age

The author of Psalm 119 is a real creative thinker. His ideas, as presented in this poem, though its form is not conducive to detailed explanation and its style is forced and repetitious, are fundamental to an understanding of Pharisaic and Rabbinic Judaism. It may well be said that this Psalm is a golden guidepost on the highroad of the historical unfoldment of Judaism, from Prophecy to Pharisaism. For it is generally conceded that this religious gem is pre-Pharisaic. Its author was undoubtedly a Hasid who lived close to the Maccabaean age. He was not a mere forerunner but a creative fashioner of post-biblical Judaism.

Jewish history, from the age of Ezra to the Maccabaean era, the so-called Persian period, has not been clearly reconstructed, because of the paucity of documents and the difficulties involved in the dating of those that are available. Nonetheless it may be assumed that the ideas of the prophets and of Ezra and Nehemiah were at work fructifying life and culture. There certainly was no vacuum. Professor's Klausner's dictum of historical criticism—"*Me-efes yotze rak efes*"—"Out of nothing comes forth only nothing," is indeed applicable to this epoch. The Maccabaean revolution, with its tremendous consequences for the development of Judaism, was inspired by deep convictions and cultural maturity. No vacuum, I repeat, produced this historic event. Rather, we must assume, that men with ideas, with religious ideas, were working and teaching and influencing their generations. And the Jewish people were learning and absorbing deeply the thoughts and concepts of their teachers and sages.

Our Psalmist is undoubtedly one of the great personalities of that era. His Psalm proclaims the ideas which blossomed into the religious discipline of the Pharisees. We may be sure that he and his teachings contributed mightily to the upsurge of the Maccabaean age.

The Concept of Torah in Psalm 119

The paramount idea detailed in this poem is that of Torah. In fact the whole Psalm has been described as a paean of praise and exaltation of Torah, Torah as a way of life that lends dignity to human personality by the very surrender of the individual to its discipline. Ibn Ezra, the wise commentator, long ago pointed out that all but one of its 176 verses refer to Torah in one manner or another.

As stated, the Torah is defined as a way of life, a discipline of law. Its statutes, precepts and ordinances are "righteous altogether." Their observance is a song of joy and not a "yoke." Their study is a comfort and a delight. They effect an integrated personality, even perfection of character.

To be specific: the man who observes the Torah "walks in liberty." He is not ashamed to profess his opinions even be-

fore kings and princes; nor does ridicule intimidate him. He is of heroic stature, for he has the courage of his convictions. He despises "double talk" and weasel words. This type of man is often derided and reviled, even persecuted by vested interests. The author frequently intimates that this is his portion. But the retort is and must be: "I will keep the Torah with all my heart."

The antonym of Torah, as conceived in the Psalm, is a way of life dominated by passion and sin. The Torah-less man is motivated by falsehood, arrogance and corruption. Consequently he is contemptible, greedy and subservient. Because his life is without the discipline of law, as represented by Torah, it is steeped in chaos, without hope of salvation.

We know that the Pharisees called themselves *"haverim,"* "companions." The author uses this same term *haver* in a very interesting context: "I am a companion of all them that fear Thee, and of them that observe Thy precepts." This is, it seems to me, a very explicit definition of a member of the later Pharisaic fraternity. Is it not reasonable to assume that the Pharisees adopted the name with its complete connotation from this Psalm?

Confronting cynics and upholders of the status quo, the Torah-observant man was indeed confident, strong and steadfast. But before God, in his attitudes towards God, he was awestruck, humble and suppliant. He considered himself God's servant, praying earnestly for understanding and wisdom in order to study and observe Torah. In his persuit of perfection and salvation, he, though happy, was fearful of stumbling blocks and sins. He therefore repeatedly begs for discernment and knowledge in order that he may consider his conduct and not stray like a lost sheep.

The Personal Faith of the Psalmist

I submit that here we have a fine etching of the historic Torah-imbued Jew.

The conception of God, held by this Psalmist is not philosophic. It is rather the simple faith of a pious man. Quite naturally God is the Creator of the world; everything therein belongs to Him. Of course, God is preeminently just. Therefore, as the Law-giver, His Torah, His laws, His judgments, are of necessity just and true, always. At the same time Divine mercy and lovingkindness "fill the whole universe." It is these attributes that evoke in the religious man, humble as he is before his Maker, hope to achieve salvation, faith to attain perfection. God, in His goodness, helps man in man's searching and groping for the religious goals of life. Without God's aid these are unattainable. For man by himself is frail and of the dust; he errs and sins. Therefore man requires Divine encouragement, even positive assistance, in his desperate quest of the good life. One of the manifestations of this Divine help is the frustration of the will of the arrogant persecutors in order that the Torah-obedient man may pursue his study and meditation.

An interesting fact must be noted. The Psalmist has nothing to say specifically about Israel. As we have seen the concepts of Torah and God are beautifully etched; Torah particularly is treated in detail. It may well be that the author intends to personify Israel; *he* is that personification. Be that as it may, we have in Psalm 119 a religious document that helped shape Judaism as it has come down through the ages.

Random Thoughts

IT is easier to conquer the *yetzer ha-ra* (the inclination o evil) than to govern it.

* * *

The function of ethics should not end vith giving us an uneasy conscience, nor hat of religion with making us ill at ease in Zion.

* * *

Some outstanding non-Jewish theologians are at present intent upon proving hat human beings cannot achieve moral or spiritual perfection.

There are far more pressing problems o which they might devote their energies.

One of them which is within their jurisdiction is the following: How to prevent religion from being the divisive influence hat it is at present.

As for the problem of perfection, we can afford to wait with crossing that bridge till we get to it.

* * *

Some people, when they find it hard to believe in miracles as the essence of religion, find it necessary to put in their place ritual practices that entail sacrifice.

Their notion of religion is that it cannot be real unless it puts on the screws somewhere. If not on the mind, then on the body.

* * *

The snide remark of certain journalists hat "Reconstructionism makes the comortable more comfortable" has as much ruth to it as the opinion of the Jewish nti-Semites that Judaism makes the niserable more miserable.

* * *

When Lincoln said, "We cannot escape history," he meant we cannot avoid making history.

The more important significance of that phrase is: "We cannot avoid being made by history."

* * *

The history by which we are made provides us opportunity.

The history we make depends upon our vision.

* * *

Can we consider consequences the only criterion of right and wrong?

There was a Chinese emperor who decreed that no man should be condemned except on his own confession. The consequence was that torture of suspected persons with a view to eliciting confession became general.

Briand and Kellog got the principal nations of the world to sign a pact outlawing war. The consequence has been that a premium was placed on starting war without the formality of a declaration.

* * *

Those who make a calling of persuading people to do what they should are condemned to a lifetime of enthusiasm.

* * *

"I can conceive of nothing more lamentable than a petty Jewish state," recently pontificated Lessing Rosenwald, the leader of the American Council for Judaism.

Discussing some time ago Albania's appearance as a witness against Italy at the Paris Peace Conference, Anne O'Hare McCormick noted the extraordinary fact that the Albanian nation, which counts less than a million souls, has managed to

preserve its own language, customs and individual character through the vicissitudes and conquests of two thousand years.

But you will say, "What more than a little satellite can an Albania or an Eretz Yisrael be?"

Why be snooty about satellites? The earth is a small satellite to a mediocre star in the infinite spaces. That doesn't prevent man from thinking himself the center of the universe.

* * *

If being bigger meant being better, 'twere better to be elephantine than human.

* * *

The world owes most of its troubles to the fact that too many people with a high IQ have a low We Q.

* * *

"It is common knowledge that speeches from the Throne are written by Ministers," (N. Y. *Times,* Feb. 22, 1947).

Were the Minister—in this case Smuts —to have read the speech he had written for George VI with which to open the South African Parliament, it would have lacked the symbolic significance of imperial unity which only the King's reading gave it.

Had Moses', or any other legislator's name been appended to the commandments ascribed to God, those commandments would have lacked the authority which only the name of God could give them.

* * *

When we do as we wish, we seldom get what we want.

* * *

The ideas and ideals which a tradition transmits constitute spiritual capital.

Belonging to the past, they are like currency of a country we have migrated from.

If they are to be put into circulation, they have to be converted into the currency of the present day world.

The process of conversion is known as interpretation, or reinterpretation.

That process enables the spiritual energy stored in a tradition to continue operating in worlds far different from those in which it arose and grew.

Man lives not only by facts but also by meanings.

The stars are facts; the constellations of the Zodiac are meanings.

Energy is a fact, the theory of relativity "a free creation of the imagination."

The atom bomb is a fact; its meaning will determine its use.

There is no sharp line dividing fact from meaning.

Once meaning has produced art it is an inescapable fact.

* * *

Why the two or three Jews who are admitted into an exclusive club, neighborhood or school, generally turn out to be *Judenfresser,* may be explained by the following parable of Pestalozzi's known as "Fishes and Pike":

The fishes in a pond brought an accusation against the pike who were making ravages among them.

The judge, an old pike, said that their complaint was well-founded. The defendants, therefore, to make amends should allow two ordinary fish every year to become pike.

* * *

People often dignify their visceral reactions by calling them intuitions.

* * *

The soul to yield its best needs properly measured tension, as the violin to yield harmony needs properly tightened strings.

* * *

"For a star to be useless as a cigarette lighter is no disgrace," said Nahum Sokolow.

Book Notes

THE COMPLICITY OF GERMAN SCHOLARSHIP IN THE CRIMES OF NAZISM

HITLER'S PROFESSORS, by Max Weinreich. Yiddish Scientific Institute—(Yivo), New York, 1946.

WEINREICH'S book is a highly important contribution to the history of the recent tragedy which annihilated the larger part of European Jewry. The value of that study consists particularly in its restriction to facts, for which the author furnishes documentary evidence. He keeps within the bounds of sound research, dismissing the question, so often discussed in recent years, whether or not there is a specifically Teutonic philosophy deeply seated in the German soul and leading ultimately to megalomania and bestiality. He methodically scans and evaluates the characteristic utterances of numerous scholars justly considered as representative of the trend of the German mind after the first World War and demonstrates the closest alliance between political banditry and its learned henchmen.

It is a terrible, but true picture that the book presents. Not only would-be scholars but also men of well-established repute became the tools of an infernal hatred and provided the means of investing the most venomous propaganda with the decorum of science. Nazism from its very outset wanted to be an applied philosophy. Totalitarianism in that sense meant the mobilization of all cultural and intellectual factors found fit to serve the political end of world conquest or to justify the ruthless persecution of "inferior" races. Weinreich uses the vast sources at his disposal in an absolutely careful and objective way. He does not exaggerate. He knows how to differentiate between scholars of high professional standing and those newcomers whose biggest asset was their blind devotion to the Nazi cause, particularly to extreme anti-Semitism.

Yet even the former, at least a stupendously large number of them, hardly needed much coercion to bring them under the yoke of a government that trampled upon freedom of thought. In their attitude towards Jews and Judaism they simply followed their inborn instincts. Faithful to the Fuehrer's intentions, they trespassed the bounds of palpable experience in the fields of racial science, genetics, and eugenics, and built up a biological metaphysics—sometimes designated as "ethics"—which implicitly suggested the suppression and finally led to the extinction of human life that did not conform to "Nordic" ideals. They created the theoretic basis of that tendency, once characterized by a high Nazi official in these terms: "National Socialism is applied biology."

Of course, it took years until the plan of complete annihilation which the top Nazis no doubt had conceived from the very beginning could be performed. The theologian Gerhard Kittel, expert in Talmudic research for the party, as early as 1933 repudiated the extirpation of the Jews by violence (p. 42); and even among the political executives there may have been a few who abhorred the indiscriminate mass-murder. Weinreich mentions a

certain Kube as the advocate of a softer practice.

However, this does not matter. It is certain that, since the invasion of Soviet-Russia, when no thinking German could any longer be blind to the fate inflicted upon the Jews, the attacks from the scholars became more and more furious. A huge quantity of books were published precisely during the last years of the war. Even when the strategic situation became hopeless for Germany, conferences and congresses were convoked and foreign guests invited. For the struggle against the Jews had to be won at any cost, and it was won with the very efficient support of nazified scholarship. Until the outbreak of open warfare, certain considerations rendered it advisable to postpone the wholesale slaughter. But no time was wasted by the representatives of the various fields of research, of biology and history, sociology and political science, etc., to paint a picture of the Jews as a subhuman race which had to disappear from the surface of the globe in the interest of the German people. During the last few months the present writer read several letters from Germany in which Christians emphasized that they had not known anything of what was going on in the liquidation camps. It may be that some of those writers were just criminally indifferent to the fate of their Jewish neighbors. Yet it is unbelievable that the Nazi scholars could have been ignorant of the practical meaning and effect of their literary efforts. This applies to those who suggested extending the German living-space up to the Urals and pushing back, that is to say, extirpating the Soviet population of European Russia (p. 130), to those who rejoiced (p. 131) that the 400,000 Jews who had left the Reich borders would never again see Germany, and certainly to those physicians, who availed themselves of Jews for their experiments.

Scientific anti-Semitism was not invented in the Third Reich. But Hitlerism recognized that all anti-Jewish propaganda thus far had been a poor dilettante enterprise, compared with the systematic way German thoroughness could develop it if the party program were strictly followed. It is true that, as Weinreich points out, Hitler's professors—not only second rate writers or sham scholars, but men of genuine academic standing, even some of note—became compliant partners of a criminal gang in waging war on the Jews, the Jews in Germany, in the East and all over the world. It is also true, we may add, that if there was a minority of dissenters, they remained silent and proved by their inactivity that courage and righteousness are not necessary concomitants of scholarship.

MAX WIENER

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 9)

which is at present sponsored jointly by the American Zionist Youth Commission and the Histadruth Ivrith. Application for a charter has been made and a newly appointed Sponsors Committee will seek subscribers and patrons for the new project.

The Hebrew Arts Committee has suffered much in the past by reason of its financial dependence on Zionist organizations of which it was not the primary interest. It has, therefore, led a rather precarious existence and has been very much inhibited in its development. The importance of its aims entitle it to the support of an organization established for the sole purpose of financing its expanding program of activities.

We wish the new Foundation success.

Tehiyah | תחיה
RENASCENCE
Reconstructionist Youth Institute

An Instructive Seminar in Social Studies

By MOSHE DECTER

ON the week-end of February 22 and 23, 1947, a seminar was held in Boston for Jewish students of the social sciences. It was sponsored by the Harvard Zionist Society to carry through an idea of the late Dr. Kurt Lewin, the eminent social psychologist. Approximately fifty students from Harvard, Radcliffe, Tufts, in New England, and from Columbia, Brooklyn College, Hunter, and City College in the New York area participated.

This seminar was one of the multitude of ideas that were inspired by Dr. Lewin's thought and activity in the field of the social sciences. He had cooperated in working out the agenda of the seminar and would have had a leading role during its sessions were it not for his untimely and tragically sudden death. The original intention of the seminar was to bring together Jewish students of the social sciences, to present them with reports of some of the work undertaken in Jewish social science either by Dr. Lewin or by his assistants working under his guidance and inspiration, and to discuss future prospects for professional scientific work here and in Palestine.

Under the circumstances, the seminar was not what it most certainly would have been with Dr. Lewin's direct participation. Another disappointment was the inability of Hayim Greenberg, the noted Labor Zionist thinker and publicist, a close friend of Lewin, to participate in the seminar.

Nevertheless, despite this and other defects, the Conference presented a number of interesting aspects. These appeared in the reports of social and educational psychologists who had worked directly under Dr. Lewin in a series of projects, or who had been inspired in their objectives and methods by his thinking.

One came away from the seminar impressed, in the first instance, with a better and fuller appreciation of the wide scope and sweep of the scientific imagination and genius of Lewin. Here was a personality of nobility and fullness, an intellect of the keenest insight and widest scope, a scientist of originality, and a Jew of fervor and devotion. Not only was a full session of the seminar devoted to presenting various aspects of Lewin's character and achievements, but the spirit of Lewin dominated the entire proceedings. A number of technical phrases invented by Lewin in his scientific work were put to frequent use during the seminar, but two above all are crucial to a basic understanding of his work—"action-research" and "change-experiment."

The Significance of Action-Research

The first is a particularly intriguing notion. One of the speakers gave Lewin's

own homely but cogent explanation of this phrase, in delineating Lewin's conception of the task of the social scientist. He explained it by a story out of Jewish folk-lore. A proprietor of a large orchard became cognizant of the fact that his employees were stealing the fruits of his orchard, and he decided that he must hire a watchman. But an ordinary watchman would not do, for he too might be tempted to steal. So the proprietor hired a lame man, who could thus keep an eye on the others, but would not be able to steal because of his inability to move around. However, it soon became obvious to the proprietor that his watchman's disability prevented him from running after any other employee who did steal. His solution was to hire a second watchman, a blind man, who, though ineffective by himself, just as his crippled colleague, could mount the lame man on his shoulders, the latter directing him where to give chase. Thus the two, the blind and the lame, though entirely ineffective when separated, functioned as an integrated cohesive and effective unit when put together.

This parable Lewin applied to the field of social action, and the function of the scientist within that field. Hitherto, our action agencies have been operating on guesswork, hunches, assumptions — they have been blind. Our research agencies, on the other hand, have been lame—they have had no means, no facilities for bringing their recommendations to practical realization. Thus the task of the scientist has traditionally been considered a static one—to investigate and record the results, and no more. It was Lewin's conception to bring the blind and the lame together, so that they might become an effective unit—thus the notion of fusion of function in the term "action research." The action agencies cannot consider their work effective and significant unless it is based upon scientific investigation, while the research agencies, the scientists, cannot consider their work complete unless they participate in the concretization of the recommendation resulting from their research.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Managing Editors

MOSHE DECTER NORMAN SCHANIN

Associate Editors

B. Sheba Cogan Arthur Gilbert
Dorothy Dellar Jack Perlman
Richard Sneider

The Technique of the Change-Experiment

The term "change-experiment" ties in with the work of action-research. It is really a very simple concept. Situation A contains characteristics of an undesirable nature, characteristics which must be corrected. The situation is investigated and analyzed and the motivating factors behind those characteristics brought out. At this point, the traditional academician would stop. He has his statistics and they are published in tomes which occupy space and collect dust in libraries. But action-research is a dynamic approach. The action research group then go ahead to introduce the "change-experiment," that is, to initiate a number of projects which attempt to counter the undesirable motivations and characteristics revealed by their research. After this "change-experiment" has been carried out, another investigation is undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of the projects undertaken. This process may be repeated at intervals until effective results are obtained.

A number of very interesting reports were presented to the seminar, illustrating Lewin's methods as applied to field

f Jewish interest, particularly Zionism nd anti-Semitism. Dr. Lewin was an rdent, fervent Zionist and a firm, devot-d Jew. His great contribution lay in his pplication of his scientific techniques to ewish problems, and the scientists and udents who worked under him and were uided and inspired by him carried rough their projects in like manner.

he Harvard Zionist ociety Project

The first report was given by the stu-nts of the Harvard Zionist Society. They ad set up a project for social science udents who might use their class-room arning in action. The project was, like erything inspired by Lewin, character-ed by action research. The first step was poll of Jewish students at Harvard and adcliffe on the following four questions: a) attitude (sense of kinship) to Euro-an Jews; (b) attitude to assimilation; c) attitude to Palestine, Zionism, and *alutziut;* (d) attitude to the nature of he Jewish group.

Obviously, the purpose of this project as not merely to ascertain attitudes. It as to make Zionists—active Zionists. hus it was necessary to introduce a hange-experiment with those whose at-tudes had been analyzed as unfavorable n all the above points. The subjects were oken up into four groups: (a) those ho were already members of the Zionist rganization; (b) those who were willing join the Zionist group immediately; c) those who were "sympathetic," "fa-orable" to Zionism, but found a variety excuses for not joining the Zionist oup; (d) those who were uninterested antagonistic.

Group (c) was then divided into two ib-groups and various methods were ed to bring them to active member-ip. Lewin had always emphasized the eat desirability of using face-to-face methods in the change-experiment. So a number of interviewers were sent out to use persuasive tactics through individual contact. The second group was brought together for a group social meeting at which, during the course of the conversation, the responses to the questionnaires were analyzed and evaluated. An interesting method was used with this group. They were asked how they would, if they were on the Zionist side, deal with people who answered the questionnaire as they themselves had answered it. Thir own attempt to formulate the arguments they would use turned out to be a quite effective means of convincing them.

Group (d), the uninterested or antagonistic were also convened at a group social meeting, but with no success. The report of the Harvard student group was that they learned that it does not pay to "go after" antagonistic people. Convinced *a priori* in their opposition, these people will use the most fantastic arguments, if pushed to the wall, to retain their stand. This conclusion, however, is still tentative, for these results with group (d) are themselves subject to further analysis and new change-experiments in the spirit of Lewin's methods.

A number of general conclusions resulted from the project of the Harvard student Action-Research Group. In the first place, the interviewers learned to use their class-room disciplines in handling human material. The project also showed that college students, with competent direction and guidance, can conduct successful scientific experiments, and that they themselves can learn a great deal through such experiments. Finally, and possibly most important, the project disclosed that the participating students found a much greater interest and stimulation and group cooperation in an action-research group than in an ordinary study group, although this must not be taken

to mean that there is no value to supplementary study groups in addition to the action-research.

Dr. Chain's Report

The next report was given by Dr. Isadore Chain, one of the leading social psychologists who had worked with Dr. Lewin in the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress. He touched on some of the aspects of CCI's work in the field of prejudice generally, and of anti-Semitism in particular. Lewin's approach was not that of a genetic study of prejudice. His point was that, in terms of action, it is essentially irrelevant to discover when and how prejudices arose and were established. Prejudice is a *contemporary* problem, and not a genetic one. The essential approach must therefore be to loosen prejudices at whatever stage they may be, to change attitudes, and to "freeze" them at the new stage—to use a characteristic Lewin phrase. Important are the *methods of change* to be evolved and utilized and not the question of the *origin* of prejudice.

Dr. Chain pointed to several action-research studies made by the CCI. He had previously referred to the necessity of having action agencies sponsor research agencies who in turn would work on problems that are real and vital to the action-groups. Thus the research process must involve strategic people in action. One of the projects of CCI, interestingly enough, concerned a study of the methods of making strategic individuals more effective—"leadership training," in other words. This involves ordinary training of leaders, in the accepted understanding of the phrase. A study was also made of the mutual relationships of leaders in Jewish communities — the extent to which leaders support or hinder one another. Efforts were made to initiate projects whereby the hindrance might be eliminated and the mutual support increased. Another study was made of how to interest people in organization, to recruit them and activate them. This problem arose when CCI was invited by a Parent-Teacher Association of a certain school to undertake an investigation of prejudice in the school. When the CCI researcher came to the PTA meeting, he found that although the PTA existed on paper, the parents were not active. Thus, before CCI could do anything about prejudice in the school, it had first to work out a project for vitalizing and activating the PTA itself, on which it was to work.

A second field of CCI's Action-Research is in what Lewin called "conditions of contact." It has been a favorite argument of "good-willers" that all that is needed to eliminate prejudice is to get different groups to live together. However, this has been shown by experience to be a fallacious theory. CCI, therefore, is attempting to work out projects to prepare groups and individuals for harmonious contact once they are thrown together. A related area of inquiry is that of "isolation." "Isolation" is characterized by such common expressions as—"Some of my best friends are Jews," or, in the South, "So-and-so is a 'white' nigger." People who make such statements are *not* lying; but they are anti-Semitic and anti-Negro nonetheless, for they are isolating individuals from groups which they despise. Means are being devised to counteract this phenomenon as well as that of associating group differences only with "tension-situations." What must be done is to try to stimulate recognition of group differences in "respect-situations."

Another problem to which CCI has given consideration is that of the survival of the Jewish group within a democratic framework. There have always been those who argue that one of the chief facts

n Jewish survival hitherto has been per-ecution and discrimination, and that, giv-n a completely democratic society, the ewish group will disintegrate and disap-ear. It is a highly relevant problem to levelop methods and considerations for romoting Jewish survival under condi-ions of freedom from undemocratic dis-rimination.

imon Herman's Report

The second major report was present-d by Mr. Simon Herman, a social psy-hologist who worked wtih Lewin and vho has been very closely connected in he last two years with American college ionist groups. He recently completed a ery extensive study of *halutziut* in merica and particularly on the campus, nd his talk touched on some aspects of is study.

Herman is a member of Hechalutz; e plans to settle in Palestine soon. His bjective in making this study was to dis-over how Hechalutz can influence more eople in America—again not merely a tatistical survey, but rather an investiga-ion directed toward a definite goal. ince the dissertation is so extensive and engthy he could only present a few ighlights of his techniques and results. He hoped to answer such questions as: Why and how did people reach the de-ision to become *halutzim*? Why had hey, in the first place, come to Zionism? How does a *halutz* group differ in its ttitudes from other Jewish and Zionist outh groups?

Herman used a variety of techniques o obtain his information. (1) He used detailed questionnaire. (2) A number f his subjects wrote their life-histories ac-ording to an outline-guide. (3) He held ndividual and group interviews. (4) He athered information through observa-ion visits to various youth groups. And (5) he frequently served as counsellor to young Zionists who wanted to go to Palestine and who consulted him on their problems. In all these ways, he was able to get adequately objective knowledge of the factors in which he was interested.

On the basis of their answers, the subjects were broken up into four groups—(a) halutzim; (b) nonhalutz Zionists; (c) sympathizers; (d) non-Zionists and anti-Zionists. The answer to one question indicated how they viewed American and Palestinian Jewry. On the whole, all the groups had a more favorable view of Palestinian Jewry than of American Jewry. Groups (a), (b) and (c) ascribed happiness to Palestinians; *none* of them ascribed it to American Jews. Groups (a) and (b) ascribed psychological security to Palestinians; none to American Jews. Group (d) regarded the Jews as a religious group only, and the Jews throughout the world merely as members of separate Jewish communities but not as one people. This group viewed the problem of anti-Semitism as one of inter-personal relationships, and its solution in a change of such inter-personal relationships. The Zionist groups, on the other hand, see anti-Semitism as a group situation. All subjects of the inquiry desire equality for Jews, but groups (a) and (b) seek it in the form of equality for the Jews as a group with other groups, and groups (c) and (d) seek it in the form of equality for the Jewish individual with the Gentile individual. Finally, and highly significant, is the fact that even group (d) does not readily accept assimilation as the solution to the Jewish problem. Of a series of seven suggested solutions this group placed last in order that which specified that the Jews become lost among non-Jews. They placed first in the order of their preferences the suggestion that the solution lies in working toward better understanding between different groups. The Zionist groups placed Jewish na-

tionalism first, naturally, and placed second the course of working for a more just social and economic order.

All the groups took a most serious view of the future of the Jewish people in the United States. There was apparent a lack of a sense of hopefulness among all the subjects. Herman compared this attitude with that which he had obtained through a similar study in South Africa in 1942-3. Although prospects for physical security for Jews in South Africa are actually much darker than in America, the subjects of the South African study, concerned as they were for the future, were not as pessimistic as the Americans. In attempting to account for the difference, Herman mentioned the possibilities that the South Africans were still hopeful that impending victory in the war against the Nazis would result in the disappearance of anti-Semitism; and in addition, the Nationalist anti-Semitic party in South Africa had just been defeated in a general election. In America, on the other hand, the study was made after the victory, when it could be seen that anti-Semitism was actually on the upswing, and the resulting disillusionment caused a greater degree of pessimism regarding the future.

Although Herman had time only to touch on these matters, he indicated the questions with which he was particularly concerned: what were the conditions making for the transition of people from group (d) to (c), from (c) and (d) to (b), and finally from (b) to (a)? (He found that invariably the decision for *halutziut* had been made within the context of a Zionist group.) What were the methods and ideological approach by which this transition could be facilitated? Why did people move from (b) to (a)? What are the implications of this research in terms of Zionist action?

Jack Hurwitz's Report

The final report was given by Jack Hurwitz of the CCI in Boston. Because time was limited, he was able to give only a few details of a study made with several groups of children's clubs. Several clubs in four different age groups were studied—the age groups were: 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17. A total of 105 children was involved. Two instruments of investigation were used, the most important of which was a questionnaire given to the children in groups. The questionnaire contained nine questions in four areas: (1) label questions and symbolism—objects were labelled as Jewish, for example, and the children were asked to express their attitudes to the objects; (2) content material—the children were asked to specify whether they would prefer to learn new *Jewish* or *non-Jewish* songs or dances or stories in their clubrooms and new *Jewish* or *non-Jewish* knowledge in their class-rooms; (3) attitudes to philanthropy—should priority be given to *Jewish* or *non-Jewish* philanthropy; (4) association—would they prefer to associate with *Jewish* or *non-Jewish* people.

The general conclusion derived from this study was that *Jewish children tend to increase their rejection of their own group as they grow older.* The following are, roughly, the percentages of favorable reaction to Jewish values, in the order of progressively older age groups: 80 per cent, 42 per cent, 34 per cent, 28 per cent. The most shocking drop is thus seen to be between the 7-8 year old group and the 10-11 age group. The interesting exception was found relating to philanthropy—all the groups gave priority to Jewish philanthropy, the emphasis becoming stronger with each progressively older group. No scientific explanation was volunteered for this phenomenon because the study was too recently completed to have been analyzed completely in detailed

fashion. However, a change-experiment is now being worked out for the children. The first step will be a census of "incidents"—events, experiences, etc., related to their being Jewish. The children will be asked to recall all such "incidents" in three areas—Jew-Gentile relationships, relationship with other Jewish children, parent-child relations. An analysis of this census may indicate exactly what factors have to be eliminated and what new elements introduced in order to change the attitudes.

We have only to add, as a final note, that a numbr of projects are to be undertaken soon within the Reconstructionist Youth Institute that will attempt to adapt the techniques and ideas presented in this report to the framework of the Institute. Both the New York Chapter and the membership throughout the country is equipped to carry on such work in the light of the goals of Reconstructionism.

Civilizations: Not Quite a Panacea

By JAY B. STERN

The writer of this article is a promising young student, and an active member of Kvutza. This article first appeared in the Kvutza magazine.

Kvutza is a group of young people between the ages of 16 and 20, who began their collective career five years ago. The program of Kvutza is creative Jewish living evolving from collective group activities. The group is affiliated with the Reconstructionist Fellowship, the Brooklyn Zionist Youth Commission, and the Brooklyn Jewish Youth Council. For a more detailed account of Kvutza, see "Youth in Quest of a Living Judaism," by Norman Schanin, *The Reconstructionist,* Volume 11 Number 9.

SOME of my friends have pointed out to me that the controversy about the possibility of Jewish life in the diaspora hinges merely on the degree to which Jewish life may be lived in an alien and majority civilization. At any rate, I set forth below some of the difficulties confronting the Jew who attempts to integrate the two civilizations under which he lives.

I believe in the possibility of a vital and creative Jewish life in America. I oppose *shelilat hagalut* (a negation of the *galut*). But I cannot envision a *galut* Jewish life free from a *galut* mentality and *galut* institutions. The conflict in civilizations sets a limit to the degree of vitality and creativity that Jewish life can attain in the diaspora.

Many of us have acclaimed the "double portion" of a person living in two civilizations. The first bit of Kvutziut (program of Kvutza) that I can remember learning is our pious proclamation that a person so living, is "doubly blessed." But let us examine the possibilities of this "double blessing."

The first problem for the civilizationist is the possible conflict of ideologies. Correct or not, old-line Reform found incongruity between its Americanism and the Restoration of Zion, between tradition and the American way of life. Fortunately for the largest Jewish community in the world, there seems no apparent conflict of ideologies with the American civilization. Should one arise, however, the American civilization would not be the one to suffer.

The second problem is more of a practical nature. Being a minority in a non-Jewish environment, we are constantly dependent upon the calendar of the gentile civilization. It is commonly accepted

that the rabbi's busiest day is Sunday. The spiritual regeneration of the Jewish people may come on Shabbat, but the mechanics of Jewish life revolve about the first day of the week, Sunday. By Yom Kippur, most of the days of the Christmas vacation have been marked in our calendars for Jewish meetings. Besides being in possible conflict with non-Jewish dates, our organizations stumble all over themselves in the effort to get meeting rooms for the Christmas vacation. But for these two institutions, the Christian Sabbath and Christmas, Jewish life might find its meeting calendar seriously depleted.

And what of the civilizationist who is a *shomer Shabbat* (Sabbath-observer) and also wants to participate in the American football game?

I shall not speak of the series of drives, meetings, funds and speeches which we presume to call American Jewish life, for I presuppose that the civilizationist program will insure a Judaism as meaningful and vital as it hopes. These are conflicts *beyond* the control of any reconstructionist movement, for the reconstruction must be carried out by the minority within the confines of the majority civilization.

Thirdly, we find ourselves in conflict with the very mode of life of the majority civilization. At best we shall always wage an uphill battle in inculcating in our children the beauty and worthwhileness of the Jewish civilization. Though Judaism be inherently beautiful, it must still be lived in competition with the majority civilization, and in an alien atmosphere. The advantage of living in more than one civilization cannot be philosophically argued with a Hebrew school child. He must experience Jewish life. But living a Jewish life in the midst of a non-Jewish majority civilization will subject the child, if only by the time demanded by each civilization, to more of the non-Jewish atmosphere than the Jewish. The public schools certainly cannot be expected to foster an appreciation of a minority civilization.

Even in so Jewish an environment as that of the Brandeis Camp Institute, the sameness of Sunday with the rest of the week is destroyed, by the non-delivery of mail on that day. And Sunday is guest lecturer day at BCI, for if BCI does not recognize the special character of Sunday, the surrounding *galut* does.

In the fourth place, the social trend is toward the majority group, and this further obstructs our attempts at a vital and creative Jewish life. It is the minority which must always struggle against the alien influences of the majority. Minority life—culture, mores, customs—must always be lived super-consciously, with over-arduous attempts at inculcation. The *majority* lives its culture more or less unconsciously and inconspicuously, and creates without periodic "shots in the arm." Who ever heard of an "English Language Circle" in America? But we must resort to *hugim ivriyim* (Hebrew Circles), to maintain Hebrew culture.

I feel then, that Jewish life in *galut*, if we are to be ideologically consistent will always have to be related to the civilization.

Perhaps Jewish life is a matter of degrees. If that is the case, there will be no conflict for those able to reach a satisfactory maximum in both civilizations. But the degree varies with the individual. *Halutziut* or aliyah is the obvious solution for one deciding for the highest possible degree of Jewish life. It is the solution that I have chosen for myself. Some of you have reached a satisfactory rationale for the life you live as Jews in America. But all Jews who believe in the possibilities for a Jewish life in the diaspora must begin to consider ways and means of resolving the conflicts which it involves.